REMARKS

This Reply is responsive to the final Office Action[1] of April 15, 2009. Claims 1-23 were presented for examination and were rejected. No claims are amended, added or canceled. Claims 1, 11, 14-19 and 23 are independent claims. Claims 1-23 are pending.

Claims 14-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Sydon et al., (2002/0085520, referred to hereinafter as "Sydon") in view of newly-cited Yuen et al. (6,160,803, referred to hereinafter as "Yuen"). Claims 1-13, 16-17 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Sivakumar et al. (2005/0018631, referred to hereinafter as "Sivakumar") in view of Sydon further in view of Yuen. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Sivakumar in view of Abdesselem et al. (2001/0022791, referred to hereinafter as "Abdesselem") further in view of Yuen. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because Applicant's claims are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references taken individually, or in any reasonable combination, for the following reasons.

Background History:

Before addressing the impact of newly-cited Yuen on the final rejection, Applicant briefly reviews the history of this prosecution using only independent claim 14 as a representative example. (1) Claim 14 was non-finally rejected in the *first* office action (1/18/2007) under section 102(b) on the basis of Sydon only. (2) After

1 The Office Action may contain a number of statements characterizing the cited references and/or the claims which Applicant may not expressly identify herein. Regardless of whether or not any such statement is identified herein, Applicant does not automatically subscribe to, or acquiesce in, any such statement. Further, silence with regard to rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends, directly or indirectly, from an independent claim which Applicant deems allowable for reasons provided herein, is not acquiescence to such rejection of that dependent claim, but is recognition by Applicant that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on remarks and/or amendments presented herein relative to that independent claim.

Applicant's response, claim 14 was again non-finally rejected in a *second* office action (8/2/2007) under section 103(a) on the basis of Sydon in view of Hiben. (3) After Applicant's response, Hiben was no longer applied and claim 14 was again non-finally rejected in a *third* office action (2/4/2008) under section 103(a) on the basis of Sydon in view of Dailey. (4) After Applicants' response, Dailey was no longer applied and claim 14 was again non-finally rejected in a *fourth* office action (7/30/2008) under section 103(a) on the basis of Sydon in view of Koorapaty. (5) After Applicant's response, Koorapaty was no longer applied and claim 14 is now finally rejected in the instant *fifth* office action (4/15/2009) on the basis of Sydon in view of Yuen. The foregoing reflects a thorough examination for which Applicant expresses its appreciation to the Examiner.

However, in each response, with respect to claim 14, Applicant had pointed out, among other things, a fundamental deficiency of Sydon and the inability of a secondary reference (i.e. Hiben, Dailey or Koorapaty) to cure that deficiency. Upon each explanation, the Examiner had, apparently, seen fit to withdraw, or not continue to apply, the respective secondary reference. The instant final rejection of claim 14, now relying on Sydon and newly applied Yuen, obtains the same result - Yuen is no better than Hiben, Dailey or Koorapaty in the respect that it also does not cure the deficiency of Sydon, as explained in detail below.

Applicant submits that a TDMA scheme with divided time slots, where each divided time-slot is assigned not on the basis of transmission, but on the basis of reception, is novel, useful and non-obvious.

Independent Claims 14, 15 and 19:

Claims 14, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Sydon in view of Yuen. Consider claim Claim 14, for example, which recites:

> A network comprising:
>
> means for transmitting in the network that includes a plurality of nodes messages from more than one of the nodes using a plurality of modulation schemes, *said messages transmitted by each of said more than one of the nodes in timeslots other than a receiving timeslot for said each of said more than one of the nodes, each said receiving timeslot being assigned, respectively, to a different one of said more than one of the nodes*; and
>
> means for receiving in said one of the nodes *any of the messages from all of the other nodes in the plurality of nodes, said any of the messages being transmitted to said one of the nodes only during said receiving timeslot assigned to said one of the nodes.*

(emphasis added) Initially, it is noted that the Office Action does not apply Sydon and Yuen against all of the language in the claim. In the transmitting means, the recited italicized language "said messages transmitted by each of said more than one of the nodes in timeslots other than a receiving timeslot for said each of said more than one of the nodes, each said receiving timeslot being assigned, respectively, to a different one of said more than one of the nodes" is ignored. Also, in the receiving means, the italicized language "any of the messages from all of the other nodes in the plurality of nodes, said any of the messages being transmitted to said one of the nodes only during said receiving timeslot assigned to said one of the nodes" has been either ignored, condensed or paraphrased and, therefore, not given fair consideration. Applicant submits that the Office Action, therefore, does not meet the standard for presenting a prima facie rejection

of claim 14 based on obviousness. Sydon in combination with Yuen does not disclose or suggest this language, as further detailed below.

First of all, the Office Action (pg 2) admits that Sydon does not teach establishing a different time slot for each node for *reception* of messages and Applicant agrees. This is a fundamental deficiency of Sydon. The Office Action (pg 3) continues by saying that Sydon teaches direct communication between two or more remote units, refers to Sydon's paragraphs [0020] through [0023] and (on pg 4) mentions details of transmission such as a hopping algorithm, hop sequence or orthogonal spreading codes. As interesting as this direct communication and detail may be, and from Sydon's Figs. 2 and 3 it is seen that there is direct communication between remote units 14 and 16 as well as 20 and 22, the combination of Sydon with Yuen does not make obvious the subject matter of Applicant's claim 14. First, consider Sydon paragraph [0022]:

> [0022] As shown in FIG. 2, once the central unit 12 initiates the dedicated wireless connection or channel "f" between the first remote unit 14 and the second remote unit 16, the remote units 14 & 16 may then be allowed to communicate directly, i.e., the information communicated is not communicated through the central unit 12. The first or **"requesting"** unit 14 functions as a "temporary central unit" wherein the second remote unit 16 synchronizes to the first unit 14. Thus, in an embodiment of the communication system 10 wherein the first and second remote units 14 & 16 are comprised respectively of a personal computer and printer each having a cordless data adapter providing access to the wireless network 24, a print job **communicated from the personal computer** to the printer would be communicated directly with the printer without first going through the central unit 12. (emphasis added)

This paragraph, cited by the Examiner, clearly says that there are two communicating units 14 and 16, where personal computer 14 requests communication with printer 16 which synchronizes to that request from personal computer 14. It further says a print job is communicated from personal computer 14 to printer 16. Thus, this scenario is nothing more than a communication between two units based on a *transmission* timeslot

established by personal computer 14 to which printer 16 dutifully self-synchronizes. This is confirmation of the Office Action admission of Sydon's deficiency and confirmation of Applicant's view of Sydon as previously expressed in the record. There is nothing being taught or suggested in this section, or any other section of Sydon, which says that communications timeslots are established on the basis of *reception*. The mere fact that a particular transmission technique, such as a hopping algorithm, a hop sequence or orthogonal spreading code may be used, as mentioned in page 4 of the Office Action, is of no consequence relative to the obviousness rejection, even when considering secondary reference Yuen.

Yuen teaches a high processing gain spread spectrum TDMA system and method. (Title) There is a fair amount of detail provided in Yuen about how a signal can be manipulated and processed which, even if similar in some respects to the processing of a signal in Sydon, is also of no consequence relative to the obviousness rejection because Yuen does not teach assigned receiving timeslots either. Indeed, Yuen clearly states: **"The term TDMA data, as used herein, broadly means data that are *transmitted in a particular time slot.*"** (Yuen, col. 9, lines 5-7, emphasis added) This says that Yuen intends that any reference to TDMA data, throughout the Yuen patent, be viewed as data that is "transmitted in a particular time slot." Accordingly, this shows that Yuen is no better than the previously-withdrawn secondary references. Yuen must be viewed through this clearly declared constraint and, therefore, on this basis alone, cannot and does not add anything to Sydon in the section 103 rejection of claim 14. In view of this express admission in Yuen, Applicant could reasonably stop here with this argument.

Nevertheless, for sake of completeness, Applicant considers below the various Yuen citations against claim 14 that were made in the Office Action (pg 3) which are as follows: col. 8, lines 60-66; col. 9, lines 52-55; col. 9, lines 55-59; col. 17, lines 49-65; col. 9, line 64-col. 10, line 4; and col. 12, lines 11-21:

> The transmitter TDMA means is embodied as a transmitter TDMA subsystem 42. The transmitter TDMA subsystem 42 may be a TDMA circuit for sending or gating data within a particular time slot, set by base station 30. The particular time slots and sequence of time slots are communicated from base station 30 to each user, and used in the transmitter TDMA subsystem 42. (Yuen: col. 8, lines 60-66)

(emphasis added) This section says that the time slots are communicated from the base station to each user and used in the transmitter TDMA subsystem for sending within a particular timeslot. There is no disclosure or suggestion in this section that operation of the system is based on the time slots being, or being viewed as, assigned receiving timeslots.

> The transmitter TDMA subsystem 42 sends the data from the transmitter-FIFO 41 as TDMA data. The transmitter TDMA subsystem 42 sends the data using a particular time slot in a sequence of time slots, set by base station 30. The transmitter TDMA subsystem 42 is necessary for distinguishing data from different users. By sending data in the proper time slots, data from a particular user are distinguished from data from other users. (Yuen: col. 9, lines 52-59)

(emphasis added) This section says that data from a particular user is sent in a particular timeslot which occurs in a particular sequence of timeslots to distinguish that data from other user data, each user's data being sent in its own timeslot. This, again, has to do with transmission of data. Moreover, the next sentence after this section in Yuen, col. 9, lines 59-63, not cited by the Examiner, says: "Thus, the *sending* of the data in a particular time slot is what defines a user's channel, unlike other multichannel spread-spectrum

systems, where a user's channel is defined by a particular chip-sequence signal." (emphasis added) Clearly, in this follow-on sentence, Yuen is communicating that it is the sending of the data in a sending timeslot that defines the user's channel and, therefore, identifies the user. There is no disclosure or suggestion in this section or in the follow-on sentence that operation of the system is based on the time slots being, or being viewed as, assigned receiving-timeslots.

> The transmitter TDMA subsystem 42 is necessary for distinguishing data from different users. By having the proper time slot for receiving the TDMA data, data from a particular user are distinguished from data from other users. Thus, the use of different time slots in the TDMA subsystem is what defines a user's channel, unlike other multichannel spread-spectrum systems, where a user's channel is defined by a particular chip-sequence signal. By sending the data with transmitter TDMA subsystem 42, a common set of chip-sequence signals can be used by all users for the CDMA subsystem, reducing the cost of having matched filters or correlators changing to different chip-sequence signals. The reduced cost is achieved since, at a receiver, different sets of matched-filters or correlators are not required for each user but instead one set of matched filters or correlators is required for despreading the multichannel-spread-spectrum signal from all users. (Yuen; col. 17, lines 49-65)

This section says that the transmitter subsystem 42 is necessary for what distinguishes data from different users. In other words, because each user has a different timeslot for transmission, that distinguishes the data per user. The timeslot when data is received may be by default, the same timeslot when it is transmitted because of speed of light propagation. Therefore, the proper time slot for receiving the data is merely a timeslot that may correspond to the assigned timeslot for sending the data and, by default, also distinguishes the data per user, although the assigned timeslot in Yuen is an assigned sending timeslot. It further says that this scheme allows a common set of chip sequence signals to be used by all users which reduces costs, but this refers to all users each in his/her own sending time slot. There is no disclosure or suggestion that all users are sending/receiving in the same timeslot or that the time slots are assigned receiving-

timeslots. There is no disclosure or suggestion that operation of the system is based on the time slots being, or being viewed as, assigned receiving-timeslots.

> By sending the data with the transmitter TDMA subsystem 42, a common set of chip-sequence signals can be used by all users, reducing cost of having matched filters or correlators. The reduced cost is achieved since, at a receiver, only one set of matched filters or correlators would be required for the despreading the multichannel-spread-spectrum signal from all users, and different sets of matched-filters or correlators are not required for each user. (Yuen: col. 9, line 64 - col. 10, line 4)

This section says that the sending of the data by way of the TDMA transmitter 42 utilizes a common set of "chip sequence signals" which brings a commonality factor into play to reduce costs. In other words, all users, each sending in its own sending timeslot, can use the same common set of chip sequence signals, thereby saving costs. Indeed, all users don't use the common set of chip sequence signals at the same time - only during each user's TDMA sending timeslot. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the time slots are assigned receiving-timeslots. There is no disclosure or suggestion that operation of the system is based on the time slots being, or being viewed as, assigned receiving-timeslots.

> The receiver TDMA subsystem 81 selects the received-TDMA data within a particular time slot, and outputs the received-TDMA data as received data. The selecting the received-TDMA data within a particular time slot by the receiver TDMA subsystem 81, is what distinguished one user from another, since **each user transmits TDMA data with a different time slot from the other users**. For example, a first user and a second user may send first data and second data, respectively, using a first sequence of time slots and a second sequence of time slots, which are different from, and non-interfering with, each other, just like regular TDMA. (Yuen: col. 12, lines 11-21)

(emphasis added) This section says that selecting received TDMA data within a particular timeslot distinguishes one user from another because each user transmits

TDMA data in a different time slot from other users. Consequently, the received data from a particular user, received within a particular timeslot that, by default, corresponds to the sending timeslot, distinguishes the data per user. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the time slots are assigned receiving-timeslots. There is no disclosure or suggestion that operation of the system is based on the time slots being, or being viewed as, assigned receiving-timeslots.

In view of the above, not only has a prima facie rejection based on obviousness not even been properly asserted in the Office Action, but Yuen and all of the sections cited in the Office Action against claim 14 make it clear that Yuen does not teach or suggest assigned TDMA timeslots for receiving data. Therefore, because Sydon, admittedly does not teach or suggest assigned TDMA timeslots for receiving data and because it has been shown that Yuen also does teach or suggest assigned TDMA timeslots for receiving data, then the combination of those references also does not teach or suggest assigned TDMA timeslots for receiving data. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claims 15 and 19 are allowable for the same reasons as, or similar reasons to, those given above for allowability of claim 14. Claim 15 recites *inter alia*: "transmit in timeslots other than a receive timeslot for said node, each of said plurality of nodes being assigned, respectively, a different receive timeslot." Clearly, Yuen does not disclose or suggest that each node is assigned a different receive timeslot. This claim is allowable for the same reasons as, or similar reasons to, those given above for claim 14. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 19 recites *inter alia*: "wherein said timeslot assigned to the destination node, said timeslot assigned to the node, and each one of other receiving timeslots assigned, respectively, to a different one of said all other nodes, are all different timeslots." Clearly, Yuen does not disclose or suggest that each node is assigned a different receiving timeslot. This claim is allowable for the same reasons as, or similar reasons to, those given above for claim 14. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent Claims 1, 16, 17 and 23:

Independent claims 1, 16, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being un-patentable over Sivakumar in view of Sydon further in view of Yuen. Consider claim 1, for example, which recites:

> A method of communicating among nodes in a wireless network, comprising:
>
> assigning a timeslot to each of a plurality of nodes in the wireless network, the timeslot being a time for a corresponding one of the plurality of nodes to *receive* any messages transmitted by all other nodes of the plurality of nodes to the one node;
>
> assigning a modulation scheme to each of the plurality of nodes;
>
> using the assigned modulation scheme, transmitting the messages to one destination node within the plurality of nodes from all of the other of the plurality of nodes, the messages being transmitted during a timeslot assigned to the one destination node, the timeslot being other than a receiving timeslot for each of said all of the other of the plurality of nodes; and

receiving, at the one destination node, the messages from the all of the other of the plurality of nodes. (claim 1, emphasis added)

The Office Action, pages 5-6, applies Sivakumar against Applicant's timeslot assigning step which recites, interalia, "assigning a timeslot to each of a plurality of nodes" where the timeslot is "a time for a corresponding one of the plurality of nodes to **receive** any messages transmitted by all other nodes of the plurality of nodes to the one node." (emphasis added) The Office Action applies Sivakumar paragraphs [0010], [0020] and [0024] - [0042] against this method step. However, there is no disclosure within any of these many paragraphs of assigning to each node a time for receiving messages transmitted from other nodes. Although Sivakumar may have nodes that, indeed, do receive messages, those messages received by those receiving nodes are received during timeslots that are not timeslots assigned to those nodes for purposes of receiving. Rather, each of those timeslots corresponds only to a sending timeslot assigned to a sending node which is a node other than its counterpart receiving node.

The timeslots assigned to sending nodes are not timeslots assigned to receiving nodes in Sivakumar. The receiving nodes, because of the propagation velocity of an electromagnetic signal, may receive messages, by default, virtually at the same time that they are sent. But, those timeslots in which they are received are not receiving timeslots assigned to the receiving nodes; rather, they are sending timeslots assigned to the sending nodes.

Applicant has reviewed Sivakumar including its paragraphs [0003], [0010], [0020], and [0024] - [0042] which were cited against Applicant's claim 1 in the Office Action. In these many paragraphs, there is no disclosure or suggestion of "assigning a

timeslot to each of a plurality of nodes in the wireless network, the timeslot being a time for a corresponding one of the plurality of nodes to receive any messages transmitted by all other nodes of the plurality of nodes to the one node" as recited in claim 1.

APPLICANT NOTES FOR THE RECORD THAT APPLICANT PREVIOUSLY AND RESPECTFULLY ASKED THE EXAMINER TO PLEASE POINT TO ANY LANGUAGE WITHIN THE MANY CITED PARAGRAPHS OF SIVAKUMAR WHICH ALLEGEDLY TEACHES THAT SIVAKUMAR ASSIGNS RECEIVING TIMESLOTS AS RECITED IN CLAIM 1, BUT THE EXAMINER HAS NOT DONE SO. APPLICANT AGAIN RESPECTFULLY MAKES THAT SAME REQUEST.

Continuing, in further detail, Sivakumar relates to a frequency hopping spread spectrum communication system. (title) It discloses a central node 10 and dependent nodes 12a-12d which communicate over a time division duplexed, frequency hopping channel, alternating in time between slots allocated for the central node and dependent node transmission. (Fig. 2, Abstract) The "U" slots are reserved for *transmission* by the dependent nodes 12 and the D slots are reserved for *transmission* by the central node 10. (Fig. 1, ¶ 24) Furthermore, there is a restriction on *transmission* because a dependent node cannot use a next available dependent node timeslot if the central node used the previous timeslot to transmit to a dependent node. (Abstract; ¶ 10) However, all of this has nothing to do with at least the timeslot assigning step in Applicant's claim 1.

Note that the Sivakumar disclosure focuses on operational aspects of *transmission*. Fig. 1 which shows the central node D slots and the dependent node U slots is discussed in terms of transmission: "Each time slot in the hop sequence is

alternately reserved for *transmission* by the central node 10(D slots) and *transmission* by the dependent nodes (U slots)." (Sivakumar, ¶ 24, emphasis added) There is no focus in Sivakumar on timeslots for receiving. Simply because there may be some node in the network which receives a message virtually when another node transmits during a prescribed transmission timeslot, because of speed of light transmission speeds, this does not have any bearing on the subject matter of Applicant's claims. If a first node can receive a message from another network node anytime the first node is transmitted to, that is not an example of what is being recited in Applicant's claims.

Therefore, since Sivakumar does not read on the timeslot assigning step for reasons given above, since Sydon admittedly (Office Action pg 2) does not read on the timeslot assigning step: ("Sydon does not explicitly teach establishing a different time slot for each node for reception of messages.") and since Yuen does not read on the timeslot assigning step for reasons given above with respect to allowability of claim 14, then none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose or suggest the timeslot assigning step. None of the reference taken alone or in combination disclose or suggest: "assigning a timeslot to each of a plurality of nodes in the wireless network, the timeslot being a time for a corresponding one of the plurality of nodes to receive any messages transmitted by all other nodes of the plurality of nodes to the one node." Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

In addition, the Office Action (pg 7) admits that "Sivakumar in view of Sydon do not explicitly show the timeslot being other than a receiving timeslot for each of said all of the other of the plurality of nodes." This admission is made with reference to Applicant's limitation: "using the assigned modulation scheme, transmitting the messages

to one destination node within the plurality of nodes from all of the other of the plurality of nodes, the messages being transmitted during a timeslot assigned to the one destination node, the timeslot being other than a receiving timeslot for each of said all of the other of the plurality of nodes." It is clear to Applicant that Sivakumar in view of Sydon do not disclose or suggest this claim limitation, including that portion of the limitation which is stated in the Office Action.

The Office Action (pg 7) then relies upon Yuen to cure this admitted deficiency of Sivakumar in view of Sydon. However, for reasons detailed above with respect to the allowability of claim 14, Yuen fails to disclose assigned receiving timeslots. As noted above, Yuen clearly states: **"The term TDMA data, as used herein, broadly means data that are *transmitted in a particular time slot.*"** (Yuen, col. 9, lines 5-7, emphasis added) This says that Yuen intends that TDMA data, throughout the entire Yuen patent reference, be viewed as data that is "transmitted in a particular time slot." Accordingly, Yuen does not disclose or suggest operation based on assigned receiving timeslots for the nodes and, therefore, cannot teach or suggest: "using the assigned modulation scheme, transmitting the messages to one destination node within the plurality of nodes from all of the other of the plurality of nodes, the messages being transmitted during a timeslot assigned to the one destination node, the timeslot being other than a receiving timeslot for each of said all of the other of the plurality of nodes." For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claims 11, 16, 17, and 23 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Sivakumar in view of Sydon further in view of Yuen and are

allowable for reasons similar to or the same as those given above for claim 1. Consider each claim, in turn:

Claim 11 recites *inter alia*: "a plurality of receivers configured to receive any messages transmitted from all other nodes in the plurality of nodes to the node during a timeslot assigned to the node; wherein said receiving timeslot assigned to the destination node is different from all other receiving timeslots, each assigned, respectively, to one of said all other nodes." This claim is allowable for the same reasons as, or similar reasons to, those given above for claim 1. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 16 recites *inter alia*: "receiving, by a node in a network during a TDMA timeslot assigned to the node for receiving, any messages transmitted by all other nodes in the network to the node...wherein the timeslot assigned to the node is other than a receiving timeslot for said each of said all other nodes." This claim is allowable for the same reasons as, or similar reasons to, those given above for claim 1. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 17 recites *inter alia*: "receiving, by a node in a network during a TDMA timeslot assigned to the node for receiving, any messages transmitted by all other nodes in the network to the node...wherein the timeslot assigned to the node is other than a receiving timeslot for said each of said all other nodes." This claim is allowable for the same reasons as, or similar reasons to, those given above for claim 1. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 23 recites *inter alia*: "assigning a timeslot to each of said plurality of nodes, said timeslot being the time when said each of said plurality of nodes is capable of

receiving messages from all other of said plurality of nodes and being a different timeslot from all receiving timeslots assigned, respectively, to said all other of said plurality of nodes." This claim is allowable for the same reasons as, or similar reasons to, those given above for claim 1. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Sivakumar in view of Abdesselem further in view of Yuen.

Claim 18 recites *inter alia*: "wherein the timeslot assigned to the one of the ultra-wide band radios is other than a receiving timeslot for each of said all other ultra-wide band radios." Sivakumar does not disclose or suggest that each radio is assigned a different receiving timeslot for reasons given above with respect to allowability of claim 1. The Office Action (pg 26) admits that "Sivakumar in view of Abdesselem do not explicitly show wherein the timeslot assigned to the one of the ultra-wide band radios is other than a receiving timeslot for each of said all other ultra-wide band radios." Moreover, Yuen does not read on this claim limitation for reasons given above with respect to allowability of claim 14. Accordingly, claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested by Sivakumar, Abdesselem and Yuen taken individually or in any reasonable combination. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-22 are allowable, at least for reasons based on their respective dependencies from allowable claim 1.

Claims 12 and 13 are allowable, at least for reasons based on their respective dependencies from allowable claim 11.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all claims and, therefore, this application are in condition for allowance.[2]

If there are any remaining issues or if the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicant's attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number provided below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to deposit account number 07-2347. Please charge any other fees due, or credit any overpayment made to that account.

Eddy A. Valverde, Patent Paralegal
Verizon Patent Management Group
1320 North Courthouse Road, 9th floor
Arlington, VA 22201-2909
Tel: 703.351.3032
Fax 703.351.3665
CUSTOMER NO: 25,537
Date: July 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Joel Wall, Reg. No. 25,648/
Joel Wall
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,648

[2] As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.